IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.P.BALACHANDRAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 28TH FEBRUARY 2007 / 9TH PHALGUNA 1928

WP(C).No. 5835 of 2007(T)

OS.521/2000 of MUNSIFF COURT, ATTINGAL

.....

PETITIONER:

MUHAMMED ILLIYAS, S/O.MUHAMMED
THAMPY, IRAMALLI VEEDU,
NANTHAIVANAM, NAGAROOR VILLAGE,
NAGAROOR DESOM,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.C.R.SIVAKUMAR
SMT.G.VIDYA

RESPONDENTS:

IBRAHIM MUSALIAR,
S/O.KASSIMKUNJU LABHA, KALAI VEEDU,
NEAR KOLLAYIL U.P.S. JUNCTION MADATHARA,
CHITHARA VILLAGE IS NOW RESIDING AT
NANTHAIVANAM, KULANGARA VEEDU, NAGAROOR VILLAGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

ADDL. RESPONDENTS IMPLEADED

2. SULAIMAN PILLAI, S/O ALIYARKUNJU,
ATTARIKATHU VEEDU, VAVAPURAM, CHETTACHAL
FROM VITHIRA, KULANGARA VEEDU.

3. KUNJUMEERA JAMAL MUHAMMED, VAYAKKAL
VEEDU, MADAPPATTU DESOM, VELLALLOOR VILLAGE.

4. MUHAMMED HANEEFA, S/O KHADIR BAVA,
MANKOTTU VEEDU, NAGAROOR VILLAGE & DESOM.

5. JAMAL MUHAMMED ABUBAKER, VAYAKKAL
VEEDU, MADAPPATTU DESOM, VELLALLOOR VILLAGE.

6. ABDUL REHUMAN IBRAHIM, CHEKKALAYIL,
NANDAIVANAM, NAGAROOR VILLAGE AND DESOM.

Impleaded as per order dt. 28.2.07 on IA 3157/07

R1 BY ADV. SRI.R.ANILKUMAR
SRI.P.BANI
R2 TO R7 BY ADV. SRI.K.SUBHASH CHANDRA BOSE

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 28/02/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.P. Balachandran, J.

W.P.(C)No. 5835 of 2007 T

JUDGMENT

Vide interim order passed on this day, the prayer in the writ petition to appoint an Advocate Commissioner to administer the Chandanakkudam Festival was directed to be considered by the Munsiff, Attingal, before whom also, the very same prayer is advanced by filing I.A.No.524/07 in O.S. No.521/00. Hence, the second prayer made in this writ petition does not require to be considered by this Court at present. The further prayer made is to direct the Munsiff, Attingal to consider and dispose of O.S.No.521/00, pending on the file of his court within a short span of time as fixed by this Court.

2. Counsel on both sides submit that even the issues in the suit are not framed and that all the defendants in the suit have not filed even their

written statements. In the circumstances, no such direction can be issued. The prayer to appoint an Advocate as the Receiver in the suit also does not require to be considered at present, as the first respondent is already appointed as the Receiver, vide Exhibit P7 order.

In the result, I dispose of this writ petition, as no further relief can be granted on the prayers advanced.

28th February, 2007 (K.P.Balachandran, Judge)

tkv